



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/133,986	10/12/93	JOHNSON	I 7709.18US03

E3M1/1210

JOHN P. SUMNER
MERCHANT, GOULD, SMITH, EDELL,
WELTER & SCHMIDT
3100 NORWEST CENTER
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

BAYERL, R EXAMINER	
Attached to	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2301	47

DATE MAILED:

EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY RECORD

12/10/93

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) R Bayerl, PTO Examiner (3) _____
(2) Mr Vietzke, for Applicant (4) _____

Date of interview 2 conversations - 29 Nov 1993

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description: _____

Agreement ☐ was reached with respect to some or all of the claims in question. ☒ was not reached.

Claims discussed: 45, 60, 56

Identification of prior art discussed: Art cited in parent Application, Donald et al.
(US #5,053,956)

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant seeks method claim coverage comparable to that provided in the parent Application (to be US Patent #5,283,865). To avoid an obviousness-type double patenting rejection, Applicant agrees to a Terminal Disclaimer. Applicant is also to provide the Examiner with prior art citations from the Rule 60 parent file, and agreed to the cancellation of claim 60, which recites a substantially different invention than found in the parent's claim.
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

Unless the paragraphs below have been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW (e.g., items 1-7 on the reverse side of this form). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, then applicant is given one month from this interview date to provide a statement of the substance of the interview.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

☐ Since the examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action.

RAYMOND J. BAYERL
PATENT EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2301

Examiner's Signature



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/133,986	10/12/93	JOHNSON	J 7709, 12US02

JOHN P. SUMNER
MERCHANT, GOULD, SMITH, EDELL,
WELTER & SCHMIDT
3100 NORWEST CENTER
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

E3M1/1210

EXAMINER	
BAYERL, R	Attached to
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	7

2301
DATE MAILED:

Second
EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY RECORD

12/10/93

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) R Bayerl, Examiner of Record (3) _____
(2) Mr. Vietzke, for Applicant (4) _____

Date of interview 2 conversations - 8 Dec-1993; 9 Dec 1993

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description: _____

Agreement ☐ was reached with respect to some or all of the claims in question. ☒ was not reached.

Claims discussed: 45, 46

Identification of prior art discussed: Read Me First, cwc, Feb 1989; Read Me First, cwc, June 1988.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Pursuant to 37 CFR 1.56, Applicant provided copies of 2 software manuals which pre-date the presumed date of invention (effective filing date). In considering them, the Examiner noted how both tend to read upon a parts sales method in which a user specifies equipment application alone (claim 45). The Examiner did not deem claim 46's additional use of part number to be suggested.
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

Unless the paragraphs below have been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW (e.g., items 1-7 on the reverse side of this form). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, then applicant is given one month from this interview date to provide a statement of the substance of the interview.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

☐ Since the examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action.

RAYMOND J. BAYERL
PATENT EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2301

Examiner's Signature